## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 18-23 and 33-49 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 18, 35, 37 and 38 are amended, and new claims 43-49 are presented. Support for the amendments to claims 18, 35, 37 and 38 and new claims 35-42 can be found, for example, in original claims 18-23 and 33-42. No new matter is added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

# Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejects claims 35-37 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) over Sakamizu et al. ("Structural Design of Resin Matrix and Acid-labile Dissolution Inhibitor of Chemical Amplification Positive Electron-beam Resist for Gigabit Lithograph," Journal of Photopolymer Science and Technology, vol. 11, no. 4 (1998), pp. 547-552) ("Sakamizu"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 35 is set forth above. <u>Sakamizu</u> does not disclose or suggest such a photoresist composition.

Sakamizu discloses the following dissolution inhibitor:

See Sakamizu, page 548.

Application No. 10/594,282

Reply to Office Action of November 12, 2008

Amended claim 35 does not include the organic group

Accordingly, Sakamizu does not disclose or suggest a compound as recited in claim 35.

As explained, claim 35 is not anticipated by <u>Sakamizu</u>. Claims 36 and 37 depend from claim 35 and, thus, also are not anticipated by <u>Sakamizu</u>. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

# Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

## A. <u>Sakamizu and Aoai</u>

The Office Action rejects claim 42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over <u>Sakamizu</u> in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,683,856 to Aoai et al. ("<u>Aoai</u>"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

For the reasons discussed above, <u>Sakamizu</u> does not disclose each and every feature of claim 35. <u>Aoai</u> does not remedy the deficiencies of <u>Sakamizu</u>. <u>Aoai</u> is cited for its alleged disclosure of controlling impurities. *See* Office Action, page 4. However, <u>Aoai</u>, like <u>Sakamizu</u>, fails to disclose or suggest a compound as recited in claim 35. Accordingly, the combination of references fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 35.

As explained, claim 35 would not have been rendered obvious by <u>Sakamizu</u> and <u>Aoai</u>. Claim 42 depends from claim 35 and, thus, also would not have been rendered obvious by <u>Sakamizu</u> and <u>Aoai</u>. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

## B. Ueda

The Office Action rejects claims 18-23, 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over WO 2004/036315 A1 to Ueda et al. ("<u>Ueda</u>"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In the previous response, Applicants argued that claims 18-23, 33 and 34 are entitled to the April 5, 2004 filing date of Japanese Patent Applications No. 2004-111459 and No. 2004-111460, *inter alia*, because the disclosures of Japanese Patent Applications No. 2004-111459 and No. 2004-111460 fully support claim of the present application. The Office Action asserts that the priority applications do not support the fifth and sixth organic groups of claim 18 and, thus, the priority applications cannot be relied upon. *See* Office Action, page 2. By this Amendment, claim 18 is amended to delete the fifth and sixth organic groups. Accordingly, claims 18-23, 33 and 34, in view of the amendments, are entitled to rely on the priority dates, which antedate <u>Ueda</u>.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

## C. Ito

The Office Action rejects claims 35-41 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,093,517 to Ito et al. ("Ito"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 35 and 38 are set forth above. <u>Ito</u> does not disclose or suggest such a photoresist composition.

<u>Ito</u> discloses the following calyx[4] resorcinarene:

Application No. 10/594,282 Reply to Office Action of November 12, 2008

See <u>Ito</u>, column 5, lines 18 to 59. According to Ito, the above-described acid-labile protecting groups may include:

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} C \\ H_2 \\ m \end{array}\right)_{m} R^1$$

See <u>Ito</u>, column 8, lines 44 to 59. Ito discloses the following specific examples of the groups OR in the above formula:

$$\begin{array}{c|c}
 & -0 - si - \\
 & -0 - si -$$

See Ito, column 9, lines 20 to 40.

Amended claims 35 and 38 do not include the organic group

Accordingly, Ito does not disclose or suggest compounds as recited in claims 35 and 38.

As explained, claims 35 and 38 would not have been rendered obvious by <u>Ito</u>. Claims 36, 37 and 39-41 depend variously from claims 35 and 38 and, thus, also would not have been rendered obvious by <u>Ito</u>. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

## D. Ito and Aoai

The Office Action rejects claim 42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over <u>Ito</u> in view of <u>Aoai</u>. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

For the reasons discussed above, <u>Ito</u> does not disclose each and every feature of claim 35. <u>Aoai</u> does not remedy the deficiencies of <u>Ito</u>. <u>Ito</u> is cited for its alleged disclosure of controlling impurities. *See* Office Action, page 10. However, <u>Aoai</u>, like <u>Ito</u>, fails to disclose or suggest a compound as recited in claim 35. Accordingly, the combination of references fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 35.

As explained, claim 35 would not have been rendered obvious by <u>Ito</u> and <u>Aoai</u>.

Claim 42 depends from claim 35 and, thus, also would not have been rendered obvious by <u>Ito</u> and <u>Aoai</u>. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

20

# **New Claims**

By this Amendment, new claims 43-49 are presented. New claims 43-49 correspond to original claims 35-40 and 42, wherein the organic group A is limited to the organic group

and the organic groups disclosed in <u>Sakamizu</u> and <u>Ito</u> are excluded from organic groups B, C and D. New claims 43-49 are believed to distinguish over the references of record.

# Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claims 18-23 and 33-49 are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Norman F. Qblon

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 08/07) Jacob A. Doughty/ Registration No. 46,671